



7-1-1994

## Some Perceptions of Perception

Don Diespecker

*Australian Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.ciis.edu/ijts-transpersonalstudies>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#), [Psychology Commons](#), and the [Religion Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Diespecker, D. (1994). Diespecker, D. (1994). Some perceptions of perception. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 13(2), 44–55.. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 13 (2). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.ciis.edu/ijts-transpersonalstudies/vol13/iss2/6>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](#).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals and Newsletters at Digital Commons @ CIIS. It has been accepted for inclusion in *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies* by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ CIIS. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@ciis.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@ciis.edu).

## **SOME PERCEPTIONS OF PERCEPTION**

**DON DIESPECKER**

**FOUNDING EDITOR**

**AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF TRANSPERSONAL  
PSYCHOLOGY**

**THORA, NSW**

**AUSTRALIA**

The modern world began on 29 May 1919 when photographs of a solar eclipse, taken on the island of Principe off West Africa and at Sobral in Brazil, confirmed the truth of a new theory of the universe. It had been apparent for half a century that the Newtonian cosmology, based upon the straight lines of Euclidean geometry and Galileo's notions of absolute time, was in need of serious modification. It had stood for more than two hundred years. It was the framework within which the European Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, and the vast expansion of human knowledge, freedom and prosperity which characterized the nineteenth century, had taken place. But increasingly powerful telescopes were revealing anomalies. In particular, the motions of the planet Mercury deviated by forty-three seconds of arc a century from its predictable behaviour under Newtonian laws of physics. Why?

Paul Johnson, *Modern Times. From the Twenties to the Nineties*, 1991.

The major problems of our time are all different facets of one and the same crisis, which is essentially a crisis of perception. Like the crisis in physics in the 1920s, it derives from the fact that we are trying to apply the concepts of an outdated world-view-the mechanistic world view of Cartesian-Newtonian science--to a reality that can no longer be understood in terms of these concepts.

Fritjof Capra, *The Turning Point. Science, Society, and the Rising Culture* (dustcover), 1982.

...as Huang Po stated, "Let me remind you that the perceived cannot perceive," that, in other words, my "self," since it can be perceived, cannot be that which is perceiving. But what is that in me which is perceiving?

Ken Wilber, *The Spectrum of Consciousness*, 1977. (p84)

The new theory of the universe was of course Albert Einstein's *On the electrodynamics of moving bodies*, which became better known as the Special Theory of Relativity. This would have been a good time to throw out the Cartesian-Newtonian paradigm--and an excellent time to have strangled behaviorism shortly after its birth. Unfortunately for all of us, neither dramatic event happened, and in many ways, both phenomena continue to be revered. Psychology, which has foolishly prided itself on being "scientific" is, at best, merely pseudo-scientific and it has yet to understand and to accept the quantum approach to science. Thus, contemporary psychology and the behavioral sciences are 19th century oddities time-warping their blinkered ways through the end of the 20th century. It is not only the Newtonian cosmology that requires serious modification: Newtonian psychology and related disciplines also desperately need it.

I hardly noticed Capra's statement when I first read it. Perhaps it would be more accurate to write: I did not properly understand the meaning of Capra's words at the time. It is indeed simple and straightforward, yet the implications of those words are astounding. I have been slow to comprehend both denotation and connotation and it has taken me many years to come to terms with what perception might be. There is now abundant evidence that consciousness, for example, has begun to be accepted and understood within science (see Sperry, 1987). In general psychology, the concept of consciousness has been out in the cold for so long that there is danger of its never becoming understood, and never accepted. All of psychology may therefore disappear from our intellectual radar screens and self-destruct: very few people are likely to notice.

All of these heady possibilities, I am suggesting, are matters of perceiving and of misperceiving: a "new cosmology" is too breath-taking to not be noticed. Curiously, most of our scientific colleagues have continued to do just that; psychology has been somnambulant since 1912 and the birth of Modern Times has been largely disregarded. Neither science in general, nor the "social sciences" in particular, had wise persons posted who might have watched for the birth of a new way of perceiving perception.

Those of us who write on matters transpersonal are writing in ways which are generally in the style of the "mechanistic world view" and we have not yet learned to write in new or in transpersonal ways. We are not yet articulate about perceiving how we might better do that because we have yet to understand what we do when we perceive. This being so, we surely need to revise our notions of what perception might be--and then we will have a better appreciation of how to review our transpersonal writing styles. If we do this well, we might then be able to write more comprehensively and coherently on the transpersonal stance. It stands to reason, therefore, that we also misperceive that which is transpersonal.

Perception is certainly fundamental, yet it is not the only notion within the transpersonal realm that demands our attention; another is surely Smuts' (1926) holism. Holism is central to a comprehensive study of what we describe as transpersonal--and holism is seldom mentioned, let alone explained or discussed--in transpersonal writings. Another neglected notion, it seems to me, is the extent to which the transpersonal endeavour is a "psychology" rather than a "spiritual discipline" (it may be neither; it may simply be an intellectual invention). It is,

however, our perception of what perception is, that is most ignored. It follows that the transpersonal perspective is fuzzy for many of us; it means different things to different people. What all of this should be so is a mystery to me. It may be a mystery to many others--and these (for me) "central issues" do not appear to be either mysterious enough or urgent enough for them to be explored with excitement and delight in national and international transpersonal conventions.

The question of what perception might be is not a slight one as it affects us all; indeed, it is surely at the heart of our diverse perspectives of What is. It is a question that cuts through cultural differences as well as through all of the sciences. General science continues its explorations largely on the basis of the mechanistic model of perception although such underlying assumptions and beliefs now appear to be changing. For example, Sperry (1987) refers to the consciousness revolution in behavioral science as representing "...a fundamental correction applying not only to all the sciences but also to the humanities and to contemporary thought in general"--and I doubt that behavioral science has noticed this! That revolution, Sperry reminds us, represents "a conceptual shift to a different form of causal determinism." In the new view, macrodeterminism is becoming all-important and may be seen as a valid paradigm for all science. Needless to say, most psychology and the rest of the so-called behavioral sciences have not yet perceived that there is a "consciousness revolution" and remain wedded to ephemeral behaviours of one kind or another. Sperry argues for "an interactionist concept of consciousness that gives subjective mental phenomena a causal role in brain processing and behavior." This notion is already seven years old. Has it amazed and overwhelmed the scientists, including the behavioral ones? I think not.

A point we all might make more of is this: the so-called consciousness revolution began to emerge from humanistic psychology and now appears to flourish in transpersonal psychology; it could not have emerged from behaviorism and neither was it inspired by subatomic physics. Is this not a notion encouraging us to march, with drums beating and banners flying? Apparently not.

What the consciousness revolution is, and what perception might be, deserve to be thoroughly understood within the transpersonal perspective. This is not yet happening, or if it is, it is happening so unobtrusively as to be both invisible and inaudible. The alternative will be to ignore both or to tacitly encourage a blind New Age pseudo-philosophy to hijack the concepts.

Ordinary psychologists, like most ordinary mortals, tend to operate in the world as if the appropriate paths to understanding are merely old trails which were once blazed through consensus reality or ordinary consciousness. If psychologists do not operate that way, they are extraordinary, and the ways in which they perceive the world and operate within it tend, also, to be extraordinary. Our paths must necessarily be made in extraordinary consciousness; our grabs for attention in relevant and appropriate journals must demonstrate the extraordinariness of the world and of the universe of which we are parts--otherwise editors are being persuaded to publish the mundane, the trivial, the false, and the irrelevant. Notions like "psyche," "the inner life," and "intuition" imply that when we cogitate and meditate we are able (at least sometimes) to do so from within--and that we are not entirely contaminated by our psychotic-like attachment to

consensus reality. Such notions are the business as well as the politics of that which we call transpersonal. Yet much of what seems to be transpersonal consists of that which is cool, hip, and groovy; tapes to relax by; Master Classes by self-proclaimed sages and gurus; and an endless array of phony new visions of reality, channelling, and general ratbagery. Most of this misperceived rubbish used to thrive in humanistic psychology; now it has swept, virus-like into the transpersonal realm.

The point I am touching on now is this: psychologists (in particular) of whatever persuasion are inclined to perceive the world in much the same way; this way can only identify with, and certainly derives from, Cartesian-Newtonian (C-N) thinking. This way of perceiving is also typically the way of consensus reality. Is this the way we want to go? We have been so much indoctrinated and conditioned by C-N perceiving that our knowing is invariably fuzzed-over.

I hasten to add that most people--you can bet on it--in our culture are as bemused as most of the psychologists: we uncritically and without much awareness support theories and notions of perception which are mechanistic, unidirectional, and sensory-based. It hardly occurs to most of us most of the time that this is not what perception is--and it escapes the attention of almost everyone that whatever it is that perception might be, it makes little or no difference to how we live and move and have our being. Surely it ought to, because here is the disturbing implication that we expertly misperceive almost everything--almost all of the time.

### **Perceptions and Elevated Journals**

I recall Capra quoting Henderson in his book: that there are two kinds of economists--those who don't know and those who don't know they don't know. It is much the same for the rest of us, I fear; it is certainly much the same for the majority of us who scramble for space in transpersonally-oriented journals. Writers write books and articles in order to see them published; we do not always give a damn whether or not readers read us, or if they do, whether they agree, disagree, or are profoundly bored with our words. It's nice to think that some readers might be profoundly moved, but we don't really expect them to be; we're merely writing in order to see our stuff in print. Getting the words into print is the thing. In this sense all of the journals which attempt to cover our field are the literary equivalents of photo opportunities for politicians and celebrities. Freshly printed writings bearing our names are experienced as the sweet smells of success.

Some of our journals encourage profundity, others seek lightness; all of them hope for some kind of intellectual impact, some measure of saleability and future respectability and even prestige. Some journals fly higher than others. Those that see themselves as being particularly High Journals are generally able to observe mindscapes, entities, and anything we care to speculate about--in apparently scientific and objective ways. The higher the journal, the more it objectifies; everything becomes "object out there." Science is steeped in dualism and the more scientific the journal the more it pretends that it is marvellously separate from its objects of perception. Thus, high journals suffer, without knowing it, from dualistic overkill.

Wilber (1977) reminds us that there are two basic modes of knowing. One is

"symbolic, or map, or inferential, or dualistic knowledge; while the other has been called intimate, or direct, or non-dual knowledge" (p. 43).

He discusses this notion more fully in *Eye to Eye* (1979) and describes the "three eyes" or modes of attaining knowledge: the empirical eye; the eyes of reason; the eye of contemplation.

Does this not also imply different ways of perceiving? Whether any of this is true or not, we certainly begin to think along these lines when we start to explore the transpersonal realm. However our explorations are misperceptions, because we are "observing" with an obsolete and ignored model of perception. Our studies are therefore based on ignorance.

We all have our favourite ways of typifying and categorising. One of mine is to begin to argue for intensive studies of transpersonal psychology: let us discover what we know. That psychology, I would suggest, also includes a more general "transpersonal perspective," one that is not steeped exclusively in psychological concepts. The psychology which is transpersonal is a paradoxical one--and it is also at the sharp end of the constellation of all psychologies, East and West, because it is the last of the possible psychologies that we can study before finishing with all of them and entering into new realms. Some of these realms, at least in my view, are best passed by--organized religions, for example. Others, like meditations, and that art of knowing about reality, mysticism, are areas of enchanting discovery and we ought not to pass them by without knowing what they are. If we must become enchanted or bewitched, this is a good place to rest.

I'm suggesting that a transpersonal psychologist and a "transpersonal student" are nothing more than apprentice mystagogues; they hover in the wings in preparation for more elevated work. This is not a topic which fills to bursting the pages of any journal, elevated or grounded, scientific, pseudo-scientific, or merely intellectual.

That which is transpersonal floats in a paradoxical field, like a lotus blossom in goulash, because we attempt to carry forward the "best" of all that is psychological, while we have, at the same time, some awareness of the transpersonal domain being a "no-man's land," (Wilber, chapter 10, 1977) and something to be noticed on our way toward accepting unity consciousness as our only possible identity. Wilber also uses the phrase "mistaken identities" to describe the beliefs and attachments dualistically held by people and by schools of psychology (which ought to know better). If Wilber is correct, and he is not much contradicted in our literature, the transpersonal realm undoubtedly represents an enormous example of mistaken identity. --And if that is true, we surely should give up at this point or, at the very least, work with dedication and huge energy to demythologise each and every psychology-- and then to bury them all in quicklime.

I mean by this that (i) all psychologies are limited and partial; (ii) the transpersonal endeavour is certainly both limited and partial; (iii) transpersonal psychology and transpersonal studies have burgeoned and proliferated--often without the benefit of theory.

Calling a field of study a "psychology" does not bestow any magical properties upon it. Transpersonal psychology eventuated as a result of humanistic psychology (HP) being perceived to be less than perfect: while HP expressed concerns for "the whole person," that whole person was not quite in touch with "the rest of the world." HP developed as a reaction to behaviorism's obsessive concern with behaviours.

Although transpersonal psychology and transpersonal studies afford us the luxury of being in context (consciousness, identity, e.g.,) we have done little to establish a new 'base.' An outmoded view of perception has carried over. We have no "policy" on what consciousness might be. Concepts such as "soul," "spirit," "psyche," are so little defined that they remain in danger of merely being flavour of the month words. We have stumbled, with little awareness, into a place called "transpersonal" and have paid scant attention to the need for new, relevant, and appropriate theories which might explain where we're at. We have all done this so enthusiastically that we are unable to tell ourselves, or anyone "outside" this elite clearing, precisely what perception is. If any group ought to be accepting the challenge of attempting to explain perception to an enchanted world--it is surely us. Or do we remain too conditioned?

--And I hasten to repeat: that which is transpersonal does not represent a brave new world; it does not deserve to become "established"! It is to be understood, explained, duly noted, and then left behind....We cannot intelligently attend to these matters if (a) we assume we have arrived at a summit; and if (b) we use obsolete equipment and processes to describe this strange place.

Modelling from the impermanency of psychologies has been unwise; calling the field "transpersonal studies" does not resolve the difficulty. There is no psychology which we may sensibly call well-founded; all of them have shonky foundations; all of them offer theoretical "explanations" which are largely fantasy. All psychologies are in our way; their claims are no less spurious than those of other pseudo sciences. Their best achievements are often nothing more than confusions for most of us--confusions about ego or personality or identity--and I recently heard someone on the radio discussing the measurement of "fantasy proneness." Might that, I wondered, have had something to do with the edifying experience of imagination?

Transpersonally-oriented writers are heaven-bent on explaining that which is transpersonal--with or without the benefit of theory--and in so doing we are also enshrining that, foolishly attempting to consolidate that which is as nebulous as the wisp of cloud I earlier watched being born from the river at daybreak. Why do we so unwisely fail to emphasise that "the transpersonal" is merely a transitory experience? What is it that we silly writers are trying to convince ourselves and others of? That the transpersonal endeavour is here to stay?

Given that all psychologies are both limited and partial, our readers might be better served if we were to remind them of this crushing paradox: the transpersonal domain does not glow luminously with enlightenment and is largely misperceived. If it is something to be noticed and then filed for occasional reference, then our noticing of it had better be perceptually efficient. My impression is that it is not. We invariably pretend that the transpersonal realm is

a good place to be, a safe house, if you like. It isn't. It isn't even the real world. The real world is one in which we chop wood and carry water both before and after enlightenment. Enlightenment about matters transpersonal is conspicuous by its absence. Journals devoting their space to transpersonal matters have a lot to answer for.

Any attempt to consolidate a developing transpersonal domain in an appropriate journal--like this one, perhaps--may be as misguided as the attempts to confer an unwarranted maturity on any other ephemeral psychology, or on similar disciplines. Behaviorism, for example, has peaked and been in decline for more than a generation--while horribly conditioned behaviorists, poor wretches, continue to prop it up by rediscovering cognition. This is especially tragic in Australia which psychologically remains about a hundred years behind the times. We have been in a psychological black hole in Australia for generations, and are doing little to change that. How many of our tertiary institutions teach humanistic psychology or transpersonal psychology? How many of our leading-edge psychology professors know what third or fourth force psychologies are--have you ever known one to utter the C-word, consciousness, or the M-word, Mind? They probably know a great deal about the behaviours of rats in mazes and can speak with certainty on what is clinical and abnormal--but is any of that "psychology"? I think not.

And if we are to salvage anything, let us look afresh at journals which will present vigorous debate concerning perception. We may have to look overseas for such journals and such debate--just as we must necessarily look abroad for debate on true psychologies which deliver us from the absurdity of the Freudian psychodynamic or the mindlessness of behaviorism.

When I recently looked at the index of articles in *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, the word "perception" was noticeably absent from titles. This is not a cheap shot nor an unduly critical one at what may be this fine journal's shortcomings, perceptual or otherwise; rather, it serves to underline a serious omission from a literature which is otherwise burgeoning.

In browsing through the back issue titles of 25 volumes of the JTP, I have noticed that certain concepts frequently recur in the titles of articles: psychotherapy, and meditation, for example.

These concepts have to do with psyche, with awareness, with the inner life, and they are of course invisible to us (see Schumacher, 1978). Such concepts are also taken for granted. Perception is like this too; and if anything is fundamental, then perception surely is. How we perceive ourselves in the universe is certainly the concern of all psychology and of all similar disciplines; how "transpersonal studies" or "transpersonal psychology" perceive themselves in the universe is at best, clouded.

This will serve to remind us that there is more than one theory of perception. Two questions arise: is the current theory of perception the most appropriate one for matters transpersonal; and, is there a relevant and appropriate theory of perception that we might call a "transpersonal" theory of perception?



## An Alternative Notion of Perception

I have not noticed that perception is taught, in any way, in our schools. There are no user's manuals. It is assumed that the perception that is currently in vogue is the one that has always been in vogue (which is not true anyway), and that if you want the details, any general psychology text will provide them. I have not noticed, either, that there are any warnings about the current model of perception; nor are there many guides to new models, or alternative models, or explanatory models which may shock us into new realities. For all we know, the current perception model may be dangerous to our health.

Strangely enough, however, there are other perception models: the trick is to perceive them, or to at least choose to be led in their directions by a sympathetic and understanding perceptionist.

One such alternative model that is of interest to me is linked to Lovelock's (1982) Gaia hypothesis. Abram (1985) has outlined this so well and with such clarity that I feel obliged to often re-read it because it is so disarmingly sensible that decades of my conditioning insist that I cannot comprehend it without great difficulty.

The Gaia hypothesis is that "the entire range of living matter on Earth, from whales to viruses, and from oaks to algae could be regarded as constituting a single living entity, capable of manipulating the Earth's atmosphere to suit its overall needs and endowed with faculties and powers far beyond those of its constituent parts" (Lovelock, 1982).

We all stand on the shoulders of giants; sometimes we fail to notice whose shoulders we stand on. Transpersonal disciplines are ignoring work which is not only radical and fascinating: it is work which is essential to a better understanding of what the transpersonal endeavour is. This is decidedly odd, I believe.

Some excellent examples are the writings of Gibson (1950, 1966, 1979); Merleau-Ponty (1962, 1968); Lovelock (1982, 1988); and most recently, Abram (1985, 1987). Although the theories of deep ecology, ecosophy, and Fox's (1990) approach to transpersonal ecology are also relevant here I want to emphasise perception per se and to avoid anthropocentric notions and distinctions such as "self" in Nature. The question I am raising is: what IS perception?

In 1985 Abram published *The Perceptual Implications of Gaia* in the Ecologist and this has been reprinted in ReVision (1987). Abram's writings may be crucial for those of us who still have transpersonal signs in our eyes.

The contemporary model of perception is based on the works of the empiricists Hobbes, Locke, and Hume; and the metaphysician, Berkeley, i.e. the model is largely an 18th century formulation and is frequently described as mechanistic. All of us subscribe to this way of doing perceptual business and we tend to believe that it is the only way...science uses it; all of what now passes as psychology and the behavioral sciences continue to depend upon it. Abram challenges the model. Let us also note here that empiricism means "of or pertaining to the senses."

Abram argues that if we are to take Lovelock's Gaia hypothesis seriously then we

must attend to its implications. These implications "reach beyond the separate sciences and begin to influence our ordinary perceptual experience." Understanding and accepting Gaia (Nature as a "planetary being") necessarily means perceiving in a radically different way. Gaia, as a superorganism, is a living entity which contains us; we can not, in any way, be separate from her. In this context, any argument that we are separate from Gaia or nature or Earth is like insisting that a particular cell in one's body is separate.

In a similar sense, the air we breathe (literally the spirit of Earth) may be thought of as Gaia's respiratory system; rivers, lakes and the ocean, are her circulatory system. We, and everything else that lives, are dynamic "aspects" of the biosphere--and can never be apart from it. "If Gaia exists," writes Abram, "then we are inside her." Perception can only be communication--or, as he later amplifies, communion.

The traditional view that perception is "personal" and mentalistic, and the end-product of a one-way process is nicely anthropocentric; in the model suggested by Abram, perception can only be interactional or reciprocal. That perception should be a communion-like exchange between all living things and the all-embracing presence of the biosphere is certainly a revolutionary concept. Psychologists and fellow-travellers may simply not be prepared for this revelation--or should I say, proposition. It upends all of our "psychological" notions and simultaneously sharpens the focus on matters spiritual.

An interactional perception implies that psi is both natural and all-pervasive. It suggests strongly that psyche cannot be exclusively personal--it can only be a "collective" property of the biosphere, of Gaia. Virtually all of "our" attributes, therefore, already exist in the greater Mind which contains us. Abram reminds us that in Merleau-Ponty's descriptions it is the body, or the "lived body," that does the perceiving. As Abram also explains: value, purpose, and meaning "already abound in the surrounding landscape." If it is true that self-organization and self-regulation are entirely attributable to the biosphere, then all of our claims to creativity are illusions (or delusions?) and self-aggrandizement is only a fiction.

This will "create" startling new problems: Michelangelo could not have been entirely responsible for his statue of David; all of our writings can only have been written through us (channeled, perhaps) rather than by us. All painting and dancing must be the self-expression of the superbeing that contains us. Nor should we regard Mozart too much as a genius: he had help! It has been suggested that "intrinsic musical meaning...derives from our perception of the implicate order of physical reality" (Traphagen and Traphagen, 1986). These authors pursue Wittgenstein's argument that "Music conveys to us ITSELF!" A reciprocal perception denoting notions such as "resonance" would help us to better explain the meaning of music.

While the Gaia hypothesis may be radical, at least to science, any theory or model of perception which is related to it is likely to be seen by the rest of us as revolutionary or outrageous. I am not aware of any such responses from psychologists, but perhaps I have been reading the wrong journals. It seems to me, however, that if any psychology would enthusiastically embrace such a new model, then that psychology would surely be one that is transpersonal. Curiously,

this does not seem to have eventuated.

Transpersonal psychologists are inclined to look down on the scientists because scientific paths to knowledge and understanding are entirely empirical--of or pertaining to the senses. Scientists collecting data re collecting indirect or symbolic information. Those of us who subscribe to notions which are transpersonal tend to see ourselves as better able to directly know what transcendent reality is--or better able to grasp at such possibilities because both our approaches and our experiences are more direct. Yet both science and the realm of philosophy and psychology continue to base their explorations upon a centuries-old mechanistic model of perception, the essential feature of which is that "separate sensations are built up, step by step, into a representation of the external world" (Abram). Does the transpersonal endeavour recognize an "external world"? Curiously, neither Western behavioral science nor transpersonal psychology have paid attention to either the accuracy or the tenability of this model. That is likely to encourage the view that transpersonal folk are attempting to run before they can walk. Undue emphasis on, e.g. meditative practice, may also be seen by our critics as presumptuous because the transpersonal disciplines (especially transpersonal psychology) are not fully competent to discourse on matters religious and meditative--that realm being trans-rational, trans-logical, and trans-mental (see Wilber, 1979). Reflections like this imply that transpersonal studies would become more enlightened if either, (a) they attempt a psychological consolidation by opting for a "new and better" model of perception and proceed on more certain ground; or, (b) that they emphasise the notions of impermanency and transition which, paradoxically, underlie transpersonal disciplines (Wilber's 1977 suggestion that transpersonal psychology is a "no-man's land"); or, (c) that anything calling itself "transpersonal psychology" ought to quickly change its name and abandon the pretence of being a psychology.

There is no explicit theory of perception which makes sense for those of us exploring transpersonal issues, no particular theory which is fundamentally transpersonal; however, one that begins to look like a transpersonally-oriented theory of perception is now having its genesis in Lovelock's Gaia hypothesis and Abram's "perceptual implications." We ought to attend to this.

### **Perception of the Transpersonal Can of Worms**

According to Walsh and Vaughan (1980), "A transpersonal model views our usual consciousness as a defensively contracted state." They, and other writers, compare consensus reality with psychosis: we may be described as psychotic if we have an attachment to any state of consciousness. The common view in the behavioral sciences and in psychiatry is that psychosis is a "distorted perception" of reality, a distortion such that the person is not aware of the distortion....

Given that "our usual consciousness" is consensus reality, that it is also a "distorted perception" of reality, it follows that all of the rooms in the transpersonal mansion would bar consensus reality at all costs. This is not happening. Are we all unknowingly on some kind of drug, perhaps? Also the implication is that transpersonal studies must necessarily teach a theory or theories of perception which support transpersonal notions. We cannot yet claim to have done this; nor can we sensibly discuss a "transpersonal reality" because that

would surely depend upon a way of perceiving which is other than the consensus reality way of perceiving. Clearly, we need a "transpersonal perception" which is struggling to be formulated. The field of transpersonal studies has not yet come to grips with this. We can learn from the "direct perceptionists" because the contemporary mechanistic model of perception is not appropriate for transpersonal explorations. Our best hope of redressing this might be to assist in refining an interactional model of perception as communion along the lines proposed by Abram.



## REFERENCES

- Abram, D. (1987). The perceptual implications of Gaia. The Ecologist, 15(3); reprinted in ReVision (1987), 9(2), 7-15.
- Capra, F. (1982). The turning point. Science, society, and the rising culture. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Diespecker, D.D. (1991). One mind: An introduction to transpersonal psychology. Bellingham, NSW: Earthrise.
- Fox, W. (1990). Transpersonal ecology: psychologizing eco-philosophy, The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 22(1), 59-96.
- Gibson, J.J. (1950). The perception of the visual world. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gibson, J.J. (1966). The senses considered as visual systems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gibson J.J. (1972). The ecological approach to visual perception. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Johnson, P. (1991). Modern times: From the twenties to the nineties. (Rev. Ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Lovelock, J.E. (1979). Gaia. A new look at life on earth. New York: Oxford University.
- Lovelock, J.E. (1988). The ages of Gaia. A biography of our living earth. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). The phenomenology of perception, transl. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). The visible and the invisible, transl. Alphonso Lingis. Northwestern University Press.
- Schumacher, E.F. (1978). A guide for the perplexed. London: Sphere Books (Abacus).
- Smuts, J.C. (1926). Holism and evolution. London: Macmillan.
- Sperry, R.W. (1987). Structure and significance of the consciousness revolution. The Journal of Mind and Behavior, 8(1), 37-66.
- Traphagan, J.W. and Traphagean, W. (1986). The nature of meaning in music. ReVision, 9(1), 99-104.
- Wilber, K. (1977). The spectrum of consciousness. Wheaton, ILL: Theosophical Publishing House.
- Wilber, K. (1979). Eye to eye. ReVision, 2, 3-25.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1965). The blue and brown books. New York: Harper & Row.